



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/584,386 | 04/19/2007 | Jonathan Sebastian Howes | 79257-337169 | 8999 |

35657 7590 05/12/2009

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
PATENT DOCKETING - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER
90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

VASUDEVA, AJAY

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3617

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

05/12/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

e-OfficeActionHNI@faegre.com
dweiss@faegre.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/584,386 | Applicant(s) HOWES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ajay Vasudeva | Art Unit 3617 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ajay Vasudeva. (3) ____.

(2) Mr. Soumya Panda. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: WO 95/18036.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's counsel, Mr. Panda, contacted the Examiner to discuss the indefiniteness rejection under 35 USC 112(2). The Examiner recommended amending the claim by changing the "zero lift surface" to -- foil surface -- to overcome the 112 rejection. However, the amended claim still does not define over the WO '036 reference. No specific agreement was reached regarding overcoming potential 102/103 rejections with respect to the cited art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Ajay Vasudeva/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3617 | |
|--|--|